HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL OF ONTARIO
File 2025-64274-I
Brendan Rose v. Amazon et al.
Supplementary Submission – Outsourcing of Censorship as Joint Reprisal

1) The Respondents cannot evade liability by outsourcing the act of censorship to Google/Alphabet Inc.

2) Amazon and Barnes & Noble accepted, published, and profited from the applicant's titles, then permanently disabled the applicant's publishing privileges.

3) The identical timing of suppression across Amazon, Barnes & Noble, YouTube, Rumble, and Google Search (video stalls, comment deletion, zero views, search burial) the exact week new reprisal evidence and motions were served demonstrates coordinated reprisal, not independent action.

4) The Respondents benefit directly from Google's architecture (advertising revenue, search ranking, traffic). When Google suppresses the applicant's creed-related content, the Respondents' platforms are cleansed without them having to issue a public ban or defend a direct TOS violation.

5) Outsourcing the censorship does not absolve the Respondents; it establishes joint liability for the discriminatory outcome under s.8 of the Code. A retailer who contracts a third party to remove protected speech from its shelves remains liable for the removal.

6)The Respondents have provided no non-discriminatory reason for the permanent account termination. Their silence, combined with the simultaneous multi-platform suppression, supports the inference that they directed or welcomed Google's actions as reprisal.

Brendan S. Rose
Applicant (self-represented)
December 11, 2025————————————